

Relativistic effects in two valence electron atoms and ions and search for variation of the fine structure constant

E. J. Angstmann, V. A. Dzuba,* and V. V. Flambaum†
School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia
 (Dated: February 2, 2008)

We perform accurate calculations of the dependence of transition frequencies in two valence electron atoms and ions on a variation of the fine structure constant, $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c$. The relativistic Hartree-Fock method is used with many-body perturbation theory and configuration interaction methods to calculate transition frequencies. The results are to be used in atomic-clock-type laboratory experiments designed to test whether α varies in time.

PACS numbers: PACS: 31.30.Jv, 06.20.Jr 95.30.Dr

I. INTRODUCTION

Theories unifying gravity with other interactions allow for the possible variation of physical constants (see, e.g. [1, 2, 3]). Recent analysis of quasar absorption spectra suggests that the fine structure constant α might vary in space-time [4, 5, 6]. There is an intensive search for alternative ways to test whether α is varying. One of the very promising methods to study local present-day variation of fundamental constants in time involves the use of atomic clocks. In particular, optical atomic clock transitions are suitable to study the possible variation of the fine structure constant. This is because the ratio of the frequencies of the optical transitions depend on α alone, while the frequencies of the hyperfine transitions also depend on the nuclear magnetic moments and the electron-proton mass ratio.

Laboratory measurements involve measuring how the difference between two frequencies changes with time. To relate a measurement of the change between two frequencies to a change in α , the relativistic energy shifts are needed. The relativistic energy shift describes how a level moves as α varies. Two transition frequencies with very different relativistic energy shifts are the most desirable candidates for precision experiments as they will have the largest relative frequency shift between them.

The best limit on local present day variation of the fine structure constant published to date was obtained by comparing cesium and rubidium atomic fountain clocks [7]. Experiments have also been carried out comparing cesium and magnesium [8] and a H-maser compared with a Hg II clock [9]. There are many proposals for the search of variation of α in atomic optical transitions, some of which were analyzed previously in [10, 11, 12]. In the present work we perform relativistic many-body calculations to find the relativistic energy shift for many two valence electron atoms and ions. Two valence electron atoms and ions were chosen since many new optical

clocks experiments, some of which are currently under construction and some still under consideration, utilize these atoms and ions (e.g., Al II [13], Ca I [14], Sr I [15, 16, 17], In II [18, 19, 20], Yb I, Hg I [21, 22]).

II. THEORY

In the present work we perform calculations for closed shell atoms and ions which can also be considered as atoms/ions with two valence electrons above closed shells. We start our calculations from the relativistic Hartree-Fock (RHF) (also known as Dirac-Hartree-Fock) method in the V^N approximation. This means that RHF calculations are done for the ground state of the corresponding atom/ion with all electrons included in the self-consistent field. The use of the V^N RHF approximation ensures good convergence of the consequent configuration interaction (CI) calculations for the ground state. Good accuracy for excited states is achieved by using a large set of single-electron states. Note that there is an alternative approach which uses the V^{N-2} starting approximation (with two valence electrons removed from the RHF calculations). This approach has some advantages, it is simpler, and ground and excited states are treated equally. However, the convergence with respect to the size of the basis is not as good and the final results are better in the V^N approximation. We use the V^{N-2} approximation as a test of the accuracy of calculations of the relativistic energy shifts, while presenting all results in the V^N approximation.

We use a form of the single-electron wave function that explicitly includes a dependence on α :

$$\psi(\mathbf{r})_{njlm} = \frac{1}{r} \begin{pmatrix} f(r)_{nj} \Omega(\mathbf{r}/r)_{jlm} \\ i\alpha g(r)_{nj} \tilde{\Omega}(\mathbf{r}/r)_{jlm} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

This leads to the following form of the RHF equations (in atomic units):

$$\begin{aligned} f'_n(r) + \frac{\kappa_n}{r} f_n(r) - [2 + \alpha^2(\epsilon_n - \hat{V}_{HF})] g_n(r) &= 0, \\ g'_n(r) + \frac{\kappa_n}{r} g_n(r) + (\epsilon_n - \hat{V}_{HF}) f_n(r) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

*Electronic address: V.Dzuba@unsw.edu.au

†Electronic address: V.Flambaum@unsw.edu.au

where $\kappa = (-1)^{l+j+1/2}(j+1/2)$, n is the principle quantum number and $\hat{V}_{HF}$ is the Hartree-Fock potential. The non-relativistic limit corresponds to setting $\alpha = 0$.

We then use the combination of the configuration interaction (CI) method with the many-body perturbation theory (MBPT)[23, 24]. Interactions between valence electrons are treated using the CI method while correlations between the valence electrons and the core electrons are included by means of the MBPT. We can write the effective CI Hamiltonian for two valence electrons as:

$$\hat{H}^{CI} = \hat{h}_1 + \hat{h}_2 + \hat{h}_{12} \quad (3)$$

here $\hat{h}_i$ ($i = 1$ or 2) is an effective single-electron Hamiltonian given by

$$\hat{h}_i = c\boldsymbol{\alpha} \times \mathbf{p} + (\beta - 1)mc^2 - \frac{Ze^2}{r_i} + \hat{V}_{core} + \hat{\Sigma}_1, \quad (4)$$

$\hat{V}_{core}$ is the Hartree-Fock potential created by the core electrons, it differs from $\hat{V}_{HF}$ in Eq. (2) by the contribution of the valence electrons. $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is the one-electron operator that describes the correlation interaction between a valence electron and the core. The third term in Eq. (3) describes the interaction of the valence electrons with each other and can be written as

$$\hat{h}_{12} = \frac{e^2}{r_{12}} + \hat{\Sigma}_2 \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ is a two-particle operator that describes the effects of screening of the Coulomb interaction between the valence electrons by the core electrons. The operators $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ are calculated using the second order of MBPT.

We use the same set of single-electron basis states to construct two-electron wave functions for the CI calculations and to calculate $\hat{\Sigma}$. The set is based on the B-spline technique developed by Johnson *et al* [25, 26, 27]. We use 40 B-splines in a cavity of radius $R = 40a_B$ (a_B is Bohr radius). The single-electron basis functions are linear combinations of 40 B-splines and are also eigenstates of the Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian (in the V^N potential). Therefore, we have 40 basis functions in each partial wave including the B-spline approximations to the atomic core states. We use a different number of basis states for the CI wave functions and for the calculations of $\hat{\Sigma}$. Saturation comes much faster for the CI calculations. In these calculations we use 14 states above the core in each partial wave up to $l_{max} = 3$. Inclusion of states of higher principal quantum number or angular momentum does not change the result. To calculate $\hat{\Sigma}$ we use 30 out of 40 states in each partial wave up to $l_{max} = 4$.

The results for the energies are presented in Table I. We present the energies of the $nsnp$ configuration of two electron atoms/ions with respect to their ground state $^1S_0 ns^2$. The states considered for atomic clock experiments are 3P_0 and 3P_1 . However, we present the result for other states as well for completeness, these also make it easier to analyze the accuracy of the calculations. Also,

TABLE I: Energies of the $nsnp$ configuration of two electron atoms calculated using H^{CI} , $H^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $H^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_1 + \hat{\Sigma}_2$; comparison with experiment (cm^{-1})

Atom/ ion	State	Experiment [30]	Theory		
			$\hat{H}^{CI}$	$\hat{H}^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_1$	$\hat{H}^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_{1,2}$
AlIII	3P_0	37393	36403	36987	37328
	3P_1	37454	36466	37053	37393
	3P_2	37578	36592	37185	37524
	1P_1	59852	59794	60647	60090
CaI	3P_0	15158	13701	14823	15011
	3P_1	15210	13750	14881	15066
	3P_2	15316	13851	14997	15179
	1P_1	23652	23212	24968	24378
SrI	3P_0	14318	12489	13897	14169
	3P_1	14504	12661	14107	14367
	3P_2	14899	13021	14545	14786
	1P_1	21698	20833	23012	22305
InII	3P_0	42276	37825	39238	42304
	3P_1	43349	38867	40394	43383
	3P_2	45827	41168	42974	45904
	1P_1	63034	62181	64930	62325
YbI	3P_0	17288	14377	16352	16950
	3P_1	17992	15039	17189	17705
	3P_2	19710	16550	19137	19553
	1P_1	25068	24231	27413	26654
HgI	3P_0	37645	31864	32692	37420
	3P_1	39412	33751	34778	39299
	3P_2	44043	38155	39781	44158
	1P_1	54069	50247	52994	56219
TlII	3P_0	49451	43831	43911	49865
	3P_1	52393	47091	47350	52687
	3P_2	61725	55988	56891	62263
	1P_1	75660	74291	76049	74717

transitions associated with some of these states are observed in quasar absorption spectra (e.g., the $^1S_0 - ^1P_1$ transition in Ca).

To demonstrate the importance of the core-valence correlations we include results of pure CI calculations (with no $\hat{\Sigma}$) as well as the results in which only $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is included but $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ is not. One can see that the accuracy of pure CI calculations is about 10% while inclusion of core-valence correlations improves it significantly to the level of about 1%. The deviation from experiment of the final theoretical energies for the triplet states of all atoms except Yb is not more than 1%. For Yb it is 2%. The accuracy of the singlet states is about 1% for the ions, 3-4% for CaI, SrI and HgI and 6% for YbI. The accuracy of the fine structure intervals ranges from 2 to 7%. The accuracy of calculations for Yb is not as good as for other atoms because the two electron approximation is a poor approximation for this atom. Electrons from the $4f$ subshell, which are kept frozen in present calculations, are relatively easy to excite and corresponding configurations give substantial contribution to the energy. Note that we do include these excitations perturbatively, into the $\hat{\Sigma}$ operator. However, due to their large contribution, second-order treatment

TABLE II: Calculated q coefficients, for transitions from the ground state, using H^{CI} , $H^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $H^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_1 + \hat{\Sigma}_2$

Atom/ion	State	$\hat{H}^{CI}$	$\hat{H}^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_1$	$H^{CI} + \hat{\Sigma}_{1,2}$	Other
AlII	3P_0	138	142	146	
	3P_1	200	207	211	
	3P_2	325	340	343	
CaI	1P_1	266	276	278	
	3P_0	108	115	125	
	3P_1	158	173	180	230 [10]
SrI	3P_2	260	291	294	
	1P_1	228	238	250	300 [10]
	3P_0	384	396	443	
InII	3P_1	560	609	642	667 [31]
	3P_2	939	1072	1084	
	1P_1	834	865	924	1058 [31]
YbI	3P_0	3230	2932	3787	4414 [12]
	3P_1	4325	4125	4860	5323 [12]
	3P_2	6976	7066	7767	7801 [12]
HgI	1P_1	6147	6103	6467	
	3P_0	2339	2299	2714	
	3P_1	3076	3238	3527	
TlII	3P_2	4935	5707	5883	
	1P_1	4176	4674	4951	
	3P_0	13231	9513	15299	
YbI	3P_1	15922	12167	17584	
	3P_2	22994	19515	24908	
	1P_1	20536	16622	22789	
HgI	3P_0	14535	11101	16267	19745 [12]
	3P_1	18476	14955	18845	23213 [12]
	3P_2	32287	28903	33268	31645 [12]
TlII	1P_1	28681	25160	29418	

of the excitations from the $4f$ subshell is not very accurate. On the other hand, the CI+MBPT results for Yb are still much better than pure CI values.

Note also that the CI+MBPT results presented in Table I are in good agreement with similar calculations in Refs. [28, 29].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the vicinity of the α_0 , the present day value of α , the frequency of a transition, ω , can be written as:

$$\omega = \omega_0 + qx, \quad (6)$$

where $x = (\frac{\alpha}{\alpha_0})^2 - 1$, ω_0 is the present day experimental value of the frequency and the q coefficient is the relativistic energy shift that determines the frequency dependence on α . It is clear from the above expression that q coefficients can be described by

$$q = \left. \frac{d\omega}{dx} \right|_{x=0}.$$

Thus, in order to calculate q coefficients the atomic energy levels of the atoms and ions of interest at different

TABLE III: Experimental energies and calculated q -coefficients (cm^{-1}) for transitions from the ground state ns^2 to the $nsnp$ configurations of two-electron atoms/ions

Atom/Ion	Z	State	Energy[30]	q
AlII	13	$3s3p$ 3P_0	37393.03	146
		$3s3p$ 3P_1	37453.91	211
		$3s3p$ 3P_2	37577.79	343
		$3s3p$ 1P_1	59852.02	278
CaI	20	$4s4p$ 3P_0	15157.90	125
		$4s4p$ 3P_1	15210.06	180
		$4s4p$ 3P_2	15315.94	294
		$4s4p$ 1P_1	23652.30	250
SrI	38	$5s5p$ 3P_0	14317.52	443
		$5s5p$ 3P_1	14504.35	642
		$5s5p$ 3P_2	14898.56	1084
		$5s5p$ 1P_1	21698.48	924
InII	49	$5s5p$ 3P_0	42275	3787
		$5s5p$ 3P_1	43349	4860
		$5s5p$ 3P_2	45827	7767
		$5s5p$ 1P_1	63033.81	6467
YbI	70	$6s6p$ 3P_0	17288.44	2714
		$6s6p$ 3P_1	17992.01	3527
		$6s6p$ 3P_2	19710.39	5883
		$6s6p$ 1P_1	25068.22	4951
HgI	80	$6s6p$ 3P_0	37645.08	15299
		$6s6p$ 3P_1	39412.30	17584
		$6s6p$ 3P_2	44042.98	24908
		$6s6p$ 1P_1	54068.78	22789
TlII	81	$6s6p$ 3P_0	49451	16267
		$6s6p$ 3P_1	53393	18845
		$6s6p$ 3P_2	61725	33268
		$6s6p$ 1P_1	75600	29418

values of x need to be calculated. The relativistic energy shift q is then calculated using the formulae

$$q = \frac{\omega(\Delta x) - \omega(-\Delta x)}{2\Delta x} \quad (7)$$

and

$$q = \frac{16(\omega(\Delta x) - \omega(-\Delta x)) - 2(\omega(2\Delta x) - \omega(-2\Delta x))}{24\Delta x}. \quad (8)$$

The second formula is needed to check for non-linear contributions to $d\omega/dx$. We use $\Delta x = 0.1$ and $\Delta x = 0.125$. The results are presented in Table II.

As for the energies, we use three different approximations to calculate relativistic energy shifts: (1) pure CI approximation for two valence electrons, (2) CI with $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and (3) CI+MBPT approximation with both $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ included. Inclusion of core-valence correlations lead to increased values of the q -coefficients. This is because the correlation interaction of a valence electron with the core introduces an additional attraction which increase the density of the valence electron in the vicinity of the nucleus and thus emphasize the importance of the relativistic effects.

Note that $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ are of the same order and need to be included simultaneously to obtain reliable results. $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ is much easier to calculate and inclusion of $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ alone often leads to significant improvements of the results for the energies (see Table I). However, the results for the q -coefficients show that neglecting $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ may lead to significant loss in accuracy. Indeed, the results for q 's with $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ alone are often smaller than those obtained in pure CI and CI+MBPT approximations and differ from final values by up to 50%. Since neglecting $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ cannot be justified, we present results without $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ for illustration purpose only.

The accuracy of the calculation of the q -coefficients can be estimated by comparing the CI and CI+MBPT results calculated in the V^N and V^{N-2} approximations and also by comparing the final results for the energies (including fine structure intervals) with experimental values. As one can see from Table II inclusion of the core-valence correlations can change the values of the q -coefficients by more than 15%. However, the accuracy of the energies improves significantly when core-valence correlations are included. It is natural to expect that the final accu-

racy for the q -coefficients is also higher when core-valence correlations are included. Comparison with our previous results also shows some deviation on approximately the same level (the largest relative discrepancy is for Ca where relativistic effects are small and high accuracy is not needed). Most of this discrepancy can be attributed to the inaccuracy of our old, less complete calculations. Comparison between the energies calculated in the V^N and V^{N-2} approximations and the experimental values suggest that 10% is a reasonable estimate of the accuracy of the present calculations of the relativistic energy shifts for Al II, Ca I and Sr I, 15% for In II, 25% for Yb I and 20% for Hg I and Tl II.

In Table III we present final values of the relativistic energy shifts together with the experimental energies.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the Australian Research council.

-
- [1] W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 489 (1984).
 - [2] J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. D **35**, 1805 (1987).
 - [3] T. Damour and A. M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B **423**, 596 (1994).
 - [4] J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, C. W. Churchill, M. J. Drinkwater, and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 884 (1999).
 - [5] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and J. K. Webb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 888 (1999).
 - [6] J. K. Webb, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, V. A. Dzuba, J. D. Barrow, C. W. Churchill, J. X. Prochaska, and A. M. Wolfe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091301 (2001).
 - [7] H. M. et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 150801 (2003).
 - [8] A. Godone, C. Novero, P. Tavella, and K. Rahimullah, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2364 (1993).
 - [9] J. D. Prestage, R. Tjoelker, and L. Maleki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3511 (1995).
 - [10] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and J. K. Webb, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 230 (1999).
 - [11] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, M. G. Kozlov, and M. V. Marchenko, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 022501 (2002).
 - [12] V. A. Dzuba and V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 034502 (2000).
 - [13] D.J. Wineland et. al., Proc. of the joint Mtg. IEEE Intl. Freq. Contr. Symp. and EFTF Conf., p. 68 (2003).
 - [14] T. U. et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4996 (2001).
 - [15] I. C. et al, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 030501 (2003).
 - [16] H. Katori et al, ArXiv:physics/0309043 (2003).
 - [17] M. Takamoto, and H. Katori, ArXiv:physics/0309044 (2003).
 - [18] Th. Becker *et. al.*, Proc. IEEE Int. Freq. Contr. Symp., IEEE Piscataway, NJ, Cat. No. 01CH37218, p. 76 (2001).
 - [19] W. Nagourney, Proc. IEEE Int. Freq. Contr. Symp., IEEE Piscataway, NJ, Cat. No. 01CH37218, p. 82 (2001).
 - [20] J. von Zanthier et al, Opt. Lett. **25**, 1729 (2000).
 - [21] S. Bize, private communication.
 - [22] S. G. Porsev, A. Derevianko, and E. N. Fortson, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 021403 (2004).
 - [23] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and M. Kozlov, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3948 (1996).
 - [24] V. A. Dzuba and W. Johnson, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 2459 (1998).
 - [25] W. R. Johnson and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1126 (1986).
 - [26] W. R. Johnson, M. Idrees, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 3218 (1987).
 - [27] W. R. Johnson, S. A. Blundell, and J. Sapirstein, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 307 (1988).
 - [28] S. G. Porsev, Y. G. Rakhлина, and M. G. Kozlov, J. Phys. B **32**, 1113 (1999).
 - [29] S. G. Porsev, M. G. Kozlov, Y. G. Rakhлина, and A. Derevianko, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012508 (2001).
 - [30] C. E. Moore, *Atomic Energy Levels - v. I,II, NSRDS-NBS 35* (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 1971).
 - [31] V. A. Dzuba, V. Flambaum, and M. V. Marchenko, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022506 (2003).